



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CHARLES I. AND ROME<sup>1</sup>

THE relations between Charles I. of England and the Church of Rome are of only secondary importance for our understanding of the dominating problems of that time. For in the seventeenth century the conflict was no longer between Roman Catholic and Anglican, as in the time of Elizabeth, but between Anglican and Puritan. Still, the study of the relations between the Anglican king and the papal see is of interest in more than one respect. It helps us to understand, not only the religious ideas, but the whole mentality of Charles I. The history of these relations reveals to us, better perhaps than anything else, how much Charles was a stranger to the majority of his own people, and how little he understood the age in which he lived. And we learn that he was a stranger to the English people, not only on account of his ideas of state and church government, but also, as a whole, on account of his different ideals of culture. His culture was as predominantly aesthetical, as that of the Puritans was predominantly ethical. It can hardly be denied that these contrasted ideals of culture, of which we see the best evidence in the history of Charles's relations to Rome, were also racial ones. Charles I. was of mixed race; but the characteristics of the Latin race predominated in him. He had the Latin mind.

If we try to give Charles I. a place in the history of English civilization, we most correctly rank him as belonging to that cultural movement which may briefly be described as Italianizing. It is true, he never saw Italy; but still, he may be looked upon, in a way, as the culminating point of Italian influence in England.

A few words will suffice to characterize the movement, which is well known in its outlines and importance.<sup>2</sup> It commenced among the learned circles, in the time of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, son of Henry IV., when England began to take her share in the revival of classical studies. It extended to the sphere of poetry, when Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry earl of Surrey wrote their sonnets in the Italian style, and when no higher title of honor could

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the International Historical Congress in London on April 8, 1913. Its argument is mainly based upon unprinted records in the Vatican Library. I have not deemed it necessary to give full references in every single case, as I shall have to deal at large with the same subject in the second volume of my book, *England und die Katholische Kirche* (vol. I., Rome, 1911).

The dates are given according to the new style, unless otherwise specified.

<sup>2</sup> See Lewis Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England* (New York, 1902).

be awarded to Edmund Spenser than that of the English Petrarch. It further extended to the habits and tastes of daily life, to the embellishment of houses and gardens, to the fashions in dress, to the manners of eating and drinking, to games and sports, etc. It has often been mentioned, how the "Italianate Englishman" became the object of reproach to all friends of native manners, and how the influence of Italy was considered by the Puritan party a national, a religious, and a moral danger to their country.

It was in this atmosphere of Italianizing culture that the delicate and impressionable mind of Prince Charles began to be formed. His mother, Queen Anne, was the patron of the study of the Italian language in English court society. John Florio dedicated to her his Anglo-Italian dictionary, with a flattering sonnet.<sup>3</sup> The queen made her children also learn Italian,<sup>4</sup> and through her young Charles was first imbued with that fatal predilection for Italian culture which in the future helped to widen the cleavage between the king and the people. There was then, and there is up to the present day, an invisible chain, the first link of which is aestheticism, the second Italy, and the last Roman Catholicism. Everyone knows from history, many a one also from personal observation, numerous instances of a mental development that goes through these three phases, beginning with an excessive appreciation of aesthetic culture, and ending with conversion to Rome. Now the Puritans, who hated Rome, with the keen insight of hatred mistrusted the first two links of the chain, the cult of beauty and the cult of Italy.

Queen Anne, it seems, was the first instance of this alleged mental development. I say "it seems", because we merely know the facts: that she was fond of art and of all that made life beautiful and brilliant; that she entertained a strong predilection for Italy and that she was secretly converted to the Roman Church.<sup>5</sup> These facts we know, but not whether there is a causal connexion between them or not.

We are better informed about the mental disposition and development of her son. It cannot be said, it is true, that aesthetics were the medium through which the king approached the Church of Rome. But we shall see that the sympathy which he already felt

<sup>3</sup> John Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words, or a Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues* (London, 1611).

<sup>4</sup> "Possiede ancora la nostra lingua e procura che la imparino e possiedano parimente i figliuoli." Bentivoglio, *Relatione d'Inghilterra*. Vatican Archives, Borghese I. 190, fol. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Probably in 1601. There is no longer any room for doubt with regard to her conversion, the evidence being given in two of the queen's own letters. See *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven*, VII. 301 (Rome, 1904); *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XX. 126 (1905); cf. III. 795; IV. 110.

and which was mainly founded on religious sentiment grew stronger, as the king, in pursuing his artistic tendencies, became aware of a pronounced mental affinity between himself and the actual leaders of the Catholic Church.

Love of art and interest in theology were undoubtedly the main features of Charles's intellectual character. A patronage of the fine arts, such as he exercised, has been and is unequalled for connoisseurship in the annals of English history.<sup>6</sup> He is not so singular in his love for theology. It was the heirloom from his learned father and the fruit of his early education. The prince was trained, almost from the cradle,<sup>7</sup> in religious controversy, and he never lost his delight in it. The grand almoner of Queen Henrietta Maria reports that on every occasion the king encouraged disputations between him and Anglican ministers.<sup>8</sup> The letters of Gregorio Panzani, of George Conn, of Count Rossetti, the papal agents resident with the queen from 1634 to 1641, contain many detailed accounts of religious disputations with the king himself.<sup>9</sup> They are, indeed, by far the most important source for our knowledge of the king's religious ideas in the prime of his life, during the "happy days", before the storm came. It is especially this time, the period of Charles's personal government, with which I am concerned in this paper. Before that time, the mind of Charles was not fully developed, and during the Civil War he was no longer unfettered and sincere in the expression of his real sentiments. The period of 1630-1640 is the most important, therefore, for our study of the view taken by Charles of the Church of Rome.

I shall consider first and mainly, in what respect Charles sympathized with the Catholic Church, and where he deviated from it. I propose afterwards to sketch briefly the political consequences which flowed from this sympathy of the king for Rome.

When asked by George Conn as to his faith, the king professed to believe in the decrees of the first four oecumenical councils and the three ancient creeds.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, he insisted on the importance of studying the ancient fathers at the universities, as being more im-

<sup>6</sup> See Claude Phillips, "The Picture Gallery of Charles I.", in *The Portfolio* (London, 1896).

<sup>7</sup> "Erat ab incunabulis a rege Jacobo patre educatus in controversiis qui hunc praeferere ecclesiae Cantuariensi certo statuerat apud se, si princeps Henricus primogenitus superstes fuisset." Report of Fr. Aegidius Chaiffy (?) to the cardinals of the Propaganda, Oct. 28, 1653. Archives of the Propaganda, Scrittura Originali, vol. 297, fol. 194.

<sup>8</sup> *L. c.*

<sup>9</sup> They are preserved in the Barberiniana of the Vatican Library. Transcripts are in the Public Record Office, London.

<sup>10</sup> Conn to Cardinal Barberini, Jan. 29, 1638. Vat. Library, Barb. 8642, fol. 59 v.

portant than the modern writers.<sup>11</sup> Still, in refusing to acknowledge the later councils, especially that of Trent, he held the general Protestant view. Though he did not believe in the supremacy of the pope, he strongly objected to the title assumed by Henry VIII. of "Supreme Head of the Church of England".<sup>12</sup> His objection was founded not on arguments of *political* expediency, as was the case with Queen Elizabeth, who modified the title into "Supreme Governor", but merely on his *religious* horror of schism. For the king was convinced that he was a Catholic. "I do not admit that I am a schismatic", he once remarked to Conn.<sup>13</sup> Another time, smilingly, "With your kind permission, I too belong to the Catholic Church."<sup>14</sup> Again, he said, one day, complaining, but laughing at the same time, "You cannot get used to call me a Catholic."<sup>15</sup> With more seriousness he insisted at another conversation, "My dear friend, I *am* a Catholic"; Conn answered, "None could wish it more than I." The queen's mother (Marie de' Medici), who was present, interposed, "One must be an Apostolic Roman Catholic." Whereupon the king replied, "You ladies will not understand me, but he [Conn] will: Est implicantia in adjecto".<sup>16</sup>

The king, we see, used the word Catholic, as Anglicans then did and do now, in the original sense of all-embracing, universal, and therefore understood by Catholic Church the whole body of orthodox Christians.<sup>17</sup>

It was in the same sense, that, for instance, Chillingworth dedicated his *Religion of Protestants* to the king, as "a tender-hearted and compassionate son towards your distressed mother, the *Catholic Church*". The combination "Roman Catholic" appealed to Charles as an illogical conception, as a contradiction in terms. He would probably have objected as much to the modern term of Anglo-Catholic.

The king's conviction that he was wronged by being called a schismatic was founded on his belief that he belonged to an ecclesi-

<sup>11</sup> Panzani to Barberini, March 16, 1635. Barb. 8633, fol. 246 *seq.*

<sup>12</sup> Conn to Barberini, March 19, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 194.

<sup>13</sup> Conn to Barberini, Jan. 7, 1639. Barb. 8644, fol. 9 v.

<sup>14</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 9, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 130.

<sup>15</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 15, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 142.

<sup>16</sup> Conn to Barberini, Dec. 3, 1638. Barb. 8643, fol. 210.

<sup>17</sup> Here, as elsewhere, Charles was the true disciple of his father, who defended this idea of Catholicism on the very same lines against Cardinal du Perron, as Charles did against Conn. James I. held belief in the Scripture and ancient doctrine a sufficient test of Catholicism (as did Charles I.), while Cardinal du Perron insisted that *le nom de Catholique n'est pas un nom de simple créance, mais de communion* (thus agreeing with Conn). See *Lettre de Mons. le Card. du Perron envoyée au Sieur Casaubon* (Paris, 1612), p. 7; *Isaaci Casauboni Ad Epistolam Ill. et Rev. Card. Perronii Responsio* (London, 1612), pp. 10, 20.

astical community within which salvation was possible. But although he considered the Church of England just as much as the Church of Rome to be a way of salvation, it still was his innermost wish to help forward the restoration of unity among the different branches of the Church. With all his personal delight in private controversy on theological questions the king disliked Chelsea College, his father's foundation for carrying on controversy against Romanism. "Instead of studying controversies", he said, with regard to it, "one should rather work for union."<sup>18</sup>

In the first place, he naturally wanted to bring about union in England. But to him, unity at home was only a stepping-stone to universal union. "At the price of my blood", he once swore to Conn, "I wish we were united."<sup>19</sup> Again: "In order to remove schism, I should suffer any corporal penance, but the Roman Church is too rigid in some things, as for example in upholding the decrees of Trent."<sup>20</sup> When Conn suggested arranging a disputation, Charles replied mysteriously, "The time has not come yet, things are not yet ripe. We must look forward and say nothing."<sup>21</sup>

It would be quite a mistake to doubt the sincerity and disinterestedness of the king's wish for union with Rome. King James, it is true, before his accession to the English throne, held out hopes of conversion to the pope, in order to secure his moral support with the English Catholics.<sup>22</sup> Charles had no reason to act in like manner. Indeed, it occurred to him that friendly relations to Rome might be useful for obtaining the restoration of the Palatinate, and he made it appear that in return for this he would give liberty of conscience to his Roman Catholic subjects.<sup>23</sup> But he never allowed this political consideration to affect his conception of union with Rome, to say nothing of his own conversion.

If Charles had intended to deceive the pope about his real opinion, as his father had done, he would not have pointed as frankly as he did to the reasons which stood in the way of his conversion. These difficulties, as we shall see later, were not so much connected with matters of doctrine, ritual, or church government, but had rather reference to the king's personal sense of honor and morality.

Charles knew thoroughly well the doctrine and discipline of the

<sup>18</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Sept. 30, 1636. Barb. 8637, fol. 285.

<sup>19</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 15, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 304.

<sup>20</sup> Conn to Barberini, March 12, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 184.

<sup>21</sup> *L. c.*

<sup>22</sup> See my article "Clemens VIII. und Jakob I.", in *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven*, VII. (Rome, 1904).

<sup>23</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Aug. 25, 1636. Barb. 8637, fol. 244.

Church of Rome, and in many points he agreed with both of them. When one day he corrected the popular Protestant view by declaring that an indulgence was not for remission of sin, but for remission of the (temporal) penalty due to sin, he added: "I myself believe that there is such a power in the Church and that it has been usurped by the popes."<sup>24</sup> The king believed very strongly in the importance of confession—a favorite topic with him in his conversation at dinner, and frequently dealt with in the sermons preached in the king's presence.<sup>25</sup> He would emphasize its importance for the moral discipline of men, and he set the example of going to confession himself. It is curious that his belief in the value of confession made him also an advocate of celibacy of the clergy: a married father confessor, he was afraid, would not keep the seal of the confessional.<sup>26</sup> It was the same argument in favor of moral discipline that made the king wish for the introduction of the Inquisition all over Christendom: it would be useful, he said, for checking men's tongues and pens.<sup>27</sup>

Some further points in which the king approached Catholicism may be touched upon. He was in sympathy with the cult of relics: when a piece of the Holy Cross was once found in the Tower and the queen asked him to give it to her, he answered that he would keep it, because he paid it no less veneration than she did.<sup>28</sup> He was in favor of the veneration of images, and he once sent to Spain for a crucifix. He believed in saints and in miracles, though he objected to the abundance of fables in the legends of saints<sup>29</sup> and to the excessive cult of the Virgin. When in Spain, while paying court to the Infanta, he was shocked by seeing that the people knelt to the Madonna, while they only bowed to the crucifix.<sup>30</sup> To conclude, the king strictly kept the fasts and made a point of giving to the poor what was saved from the royal expenditure by the reduction of food.<sup>31</sup>

Having so many points of contact with Rome, the king naturally felt that there was no essential difference between the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Roman Catholic creed. This point was therefore often made the subject of sermons in the chapel royal.<sup>32</sup> It is also the leading idea of a book, published in 1634, which was perhaps

<sup>24</sup> Avvisi da Londra, May 6, 1633. Barb. 8671, no. 59.

<sup>25</sup> See Panzani's and Conn's letters, *passim*.

<sup>26</sup> Rossetti to Barberini, Apr. 6, 1640. Barb. 8647, fol. 93 *seq.*

<sup>27</sup> Avvisi da Londra, May 6, 1633. Barb. 8671, no. 59.

<sup>28</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Feb. 27, 1636. Barb. 8636, fol. 134.

<sup>29</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 1, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 267.

<sup>30</sup> Conn to Barberini, Jan. 15, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 53.

<sup>31</sup> Conn to Barberini, Nov. 20, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 215.

<sup>32</sup> Avvisi da Londra, Oct. 7, 1633. Barb. 8671, no. 63.

more to the taste of the king than any other book written during his reign. Its author was a convert, Franciscus a Sancta Clara, in the world Christopher Davenport, brother of New England's John Davenport. Its title runs *Deus, Natura, Gratia, sive Tractatus de Praedestinatione*, etc. This book, which is dedicated to the king, bears on its title-page the motto: "Non habent Dei charitatem qui Ecclesiae non diligunt unitatem." Much learning and still more dialectical skill are employed to explain away all differences between the two creeds. Even the declaration of the 37th Article, that the pope has no jurisdiction in this realm, loses its point by the surprising suggestion that it probably refers merely to the feudal suzerainty claimed by the pope in the time of King John. It is admitted, however, that another interpretation is possible, and in the end the question is left open.

Now this book, this brilliant apology of the king's fondest wish, was censured at Rome. Sir Francis Windebank, the secretary of state, who was appointed to negotiate with Panzani concerning the union, was completely upset when he heard the news.<sup>33</sup> He who knew the king's mind best in this respect, and who shared the principles of his master, thought all was lost. It is true, Charles was deeply indignant, but he was too tenacious of the ideals he had once adopted as the right ones, to be disillusioned by this experience. He could not bring himself to see (what Archbishop Laud had told him from the outset) that Rome would never meet him half-way, but that everybody who was desirous of reconciliation had to go the whole length of the way to Rome.

Here we touch the point where, if I am right, the king saw the main obstacle to the cherished idea of union. Not so much religion, as honor, forbade him to accept a union which was not the result of mutual concessions. He often declared it dishonorable to change one's religion, as every Christian might be saved in his own.<sup>34</sup> The demand simply to submit to Rome was felt by him to be an affront to his present religion, which he thought excellent, because sufficient for salvation.<sup>35</sup> He therefore expected Rome to yield in some points, such as communion in both kinds, mass in English, marriage of priests (he wished to make celibacy compulsory for bishops only), and some other things.<sup>36</sup> He demanded these things not because he believed them to be the only right things, but

<sup>33</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Apr. 9, July 8, 1636. Barb. 8636, fol. 246; 8637, fol. 192 v.

<sup>34</sup> Status catholicae religionis in Anglia circa finem anni 1632. Barb. 8671, no. 52.

<sup>35</sup> Panzani to Barberini, June 27, 1636. Barb. 8637, fol. 151.

<sup>36</sup> Panzani to Barberini, March 9, 1635. Barb. 8633, fol. 216 seq.; cf. 8634, fol. 20 seq.



because, for the sake of his honor, he wanted Rome to make some advances to the Church of England. "You must induce the Pope to meet me half way", he plainly told Conn one day. Whereupon he got the clever reply: "His Holiness will even come up to London, to receive you into the Catholic Church."<sup>37</sup>

There is another point where the king thought his honor involved. He required the pope to relinquish his pretended power of deposing heretical princes.<sup>38</sup> There was not the slightest possible chance of the pope using his power against Charles. And Cardinal Barberini authorized Conn to assure the king that the pope would use his power neither against him nor his successors.<sup>39</sup> But Charles wanted more, the formal renunciation by the pope of the deposing power as a matter of principle. And this could not be granted. Barberini wrote to Conn: "Either the popes have the deposing power or they have not. If they have not, a discussion is superfluous. If they have, they cannot relinquish it, even if they wished, because in that case they would cease to be popes."<sup>40</sup>

The demand of Charles, however unacceptable to Rome, still did not go so far as King James's famous oath of allegiance.<sup>41</sup> For in this oath the English Catholics were asked not only to declare that the pope had no authority to depose the king, but also, that they abjured as impious and *heretical* this damnable doctrine that princes excommunicated by the pope may be deposed. This form of abjuration interfered with the Roman Catholic doctrinal system. It is part of the Church, not of the individual Catholic, to denounce a doctrine as heretical. And there was no possible chance that the Church would declare the doctrine of the pope's deposing power to be heretical. The utmost that could be expected was a tacit acquiescence in the fact that the English Catholics did not acknowledge the doctrine of the pope's deposing power.

King Charles was unprejudiced enough to see that this oath of allegiance was unfair. When asked by Conn to alter it, he proposed another form, according to which the Catholic subject vowed unconditional fidelity to the king and promised to defend him against every enemy at home or abroad, against all invasion, *deposition*, rebellion, etc., attempted by any prince, *priest*, or people.<sup>42</sup> The king meant to do his best, and it was only after long hesitation that he could be induced at all to think of altering the oath made

<sup>37</sup> Conn to Barberini, Aug. 14, 1637. Barb. 8641, fol. 62.

<sup>38</sup> *L. c.* and frequently *passim*.

<sup>39</sup> Barberini to Conn, Nov. 28, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 234.

<sup>40</sup> Jan. 8, 1637. Barb. 8640, fols. 35 v., 36.

<sup>41</sup> Introduced after the Gunpowder Plot by 3 Jac. I. c. 4, §9. See also Dodd's *Church History* (ed. Tierney), IV. cxviii (1841).

<sup>42</sup> Conn sent the form to Rome, Dec. 11, 1636. Barb. 8639, fols. 265, 268.

by Parliament. With all this Conn was not satisfied; he objected to the two words *deposition* and *priest*. Cardinal Barberini at once acceded to Conn's objections. Not even this new instance of refusing compliance on the side of Rome opened the king's eyes to the inflexibility of the system. He went on forming new oaths, with the same result. No allusion to church and religion was allowed to stand, if the oath was to receive the tacit approbation of Rome. Instead of words like "prince or priest" the cardinal demanded "any prince whosoever". Instead of the clause "under pretence of religion", which referred to possible attacks on the king, the cardinal required "under pretence of public welfare or any other".<sup>43</sup>

With all the willingness of Charles to meet the pope more than half-way, the negotiations with regard to the oath yielded no result. Only on the very eve of the Civil War, in 1639, the king found favor in the eyes of the papal agent: the oath which was then offered to all members of the army contained no objectionable words, except, perhaps, the closing paragraph, "from which [oath] I hold no power on earth can absolve me in any part". Conn recommended the cardinal to connive at this sentence;<sup>44</sup> the theologians of the Curia, however, refused even this.<sup>45</sup>

During the whole of this and many other transactions between Charles I. and Conn, nothing seems more remarkable than the infinite patience and pliability of the king. The king endured every sort of contradiction from Conn, he never used a word like *papist*, then universally adopted by the language of the day, and he showed no sign of anger, when Conn applied the terms of *heretic* or *schismatic* to the non-Roman Catholics of England, as indeed the papal agent continually did. Conn writes at one time: "I have dealt on religion with the king in a manner that, if he were not such a good prince, I should rather have lost my head than gained his good graces."<sup>46</sup>

This forbearance contrasts strangely with the king's ordinary jealousy of his royal dignity. A language so frank and firm as Conn's the king would never, at the time of his personal government,<sup>47</sup> have condoned in a discussion about the merits and demerits

<sup>43</sup> Barberini to Conn, March 12, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 172.

<sup>44</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 6, 1639. Barb. 8644, fols. 211, 217.

<sup>45</sup> Barberini to Conn, June 25, 1639. Barb. 8644, fol. 291.

<sup>46</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 15, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 144.

<sup>47</sup> It is true, Charles was very gentle and tolerant of contradiction when discussing the problem of church government with the Presbyterian divine, Alexander Henderson (see *The Papers which passed at New-Castle betwixt His Sacred Majestie and Mr Al. Henderson*, London, 1649); but this correspondence took place in 1646, when Charles was a captive.

of Episcopalian or Presbyterian church government. He would then have plainly refused any sort of discussion on that subject. For his natural feeling towards those who differed from him in their opinion was repugnance and contempt. If he showed indulgence with regard to the differences between himself and Conn, it was because he felt himself drawn to the system which was represented by the agent.

And George Conn, diplomatist as he was with all his seeming boldness, never lost an opportunity of bringing home to the king his affinity with Rome. It was only natural that he repeatedly assured the king that he was superior to Parliament, in his own opinion and in that of all Catholics. For a policy that aimed at improving the position of Catholics was incompatible with the acknowledgment of parliamentary prerogative. But Conn also, and almost continually, touched upon other and more delicate strings in the king's soul. He became the adviser and companion of Charles in his patronage of the fine arts. He would occasionally show the king a fine cameo or a picture, or such like, and if the king liked it, would offer it as a present.<sup>48</sup> He would induce Cardinal Barberini to make similar and more costly presents, or to negotiate the king's often difficult purchases of statues and pictures in Italy. At times the cardinal sent half a dozen, and more, works of renowned Italian painters—Lionardo, Veronese, Correggio, Andrea del Sarto, and other names occur among them. Lord Cottington, the chancellor of the exchequer, and Sir Francis Windebank, the secretary of state, both Romanizing in religion and Italianizing in taste for art, sometimes shared in these princely gifts.

Often Conn would look at the collections of the king and talk with him on art. The king evidently enjoyed his conversation far more than business. One day, at the feast of the Garter, when Charles was taking his friend over his picture gallery, he was so absorbed in it that he did not regard repeated messages that the knights were ready and waiting in full robes. There were some Puritans present who could hardly conceal their indignation at the king's cordiality with the pope's emissary.<sup>49</sup> It is a scene, I think, peculiarly characteristic both of Conn's position at court, and of the unrivalled pre-eminence which art had in the king's mind. Rather than to break off a talk over pictures, he would fail in courtesy towards the first noblemen of his realm. The king seems to have considered that only those were his equals who knew something of art. And the more dissatisfaction he found in the world of reali-

<sup>48</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 9, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 118, and frequently elsewhere.

<sup>49</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 1, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 266.

ties, the more willingly he took flight to the sanctuary of art. The arrival of a picture or a statue from Italy was an event of far greater interest to him than the news of a battle in the Thirty Years' War, or the warning of civil strife at home. He had that aristocratic gift of putting aside and dismissing from his mind whatever hurt his feelings, and of cultivating his own individuality.

Now there was nobody who appreciated this individuality better than George Conn, and thanks to him, Pope Urban VIII. and Cardinal Barberini. No more exquisite compliment was ever devised for King Charles than that which Urban paid him by allowing Bernini to make his bust.<sup>50</sup> It is practically the only bust made by Bernini of a prince not belonging to the Church of Rome. Encouraged by Cardinal Barberini, the great artist did his best, having before him Van Dyke's picture (now at Windsor) which shows the head of Charles in three positions. The delight of the king and queen when they saw the bust was boundless.<sup>51</sup>

Panzani, in one of his letters, speaks of "una certa simpatia che ha con Roma questo regno". Indeed, Panzani did not know the *regno*, he merely knew the royal court, and with regard to it the sentence is right. But the only field on which this sympathy grew into perfect harmony was the field of aesthetic culture. Here the two crowned patrons of art, the pope and the king, understood one another thoroughly well. And is it a mere accident that the only peer of the realm whose artistic nature equalled the king's, the Earl of Arundel, was a Roman Catholic? It would have been in vain for Charles to look for appreciative companions among the heads of the Puritan party.

The feeling of being understood in what he loved best, the feeling of an affinity in culture with Rome, was evidently stronger with Charles than an occasional distrust of Roman Catholic morals. Once or twice he pointed out to Conn the "indigestible" doctrines, that their priests could absolve from oaths, and that faith need not be kept with heretics.<sup>52</sup> He was also inclined to think that, under

<sup>50</sup> Panzani to Barberini, June 13, 1635. Barb. 8634, fol. 114.

<sup>51</sup> The bust was executed during the winter of 1636-1637, was embarked at Civitavecchia in April, 1637, and arrived in England in July, not "early in 1638" as Lionel Cust supposes (*Notes on Pictures in the Royal Collections*, London, 1911, p. 79). Some doubts which are entertained by Mr. Cust in regard to the dates in the early history of this memorable bust may be easily removed by the evidence given in the correspondence between Cardinal Barberini and George Conn. See especially Barberini to Conn, Apr. 27, 1637 (Barb. 8640, fol. 261), and Conn to Barberini, July 31, 1637 (8641, fols. 37, 41); cf. Frascchetti, *Il Bernini* (Milan, 1900), p. 111, n. 1. We are indebted to Mr. Cust for the reproduction of the only engraving extant of the bust (*Notes*, p. 8).

<sup>52</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 9, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 130. Cf. Apr. 24, 1637, Barb. 8640, fol. 248 *seq.*

given circumstances, the Church of Rome favored the doctrine of tyrannicide.<sup>53</sup> But, more or less, he used to associate these blemishes of Roman Catholicism with the Jesuits, who were in his mind on a level with the Puritans. Strange as it sounds, the king seldom mentioned the Puritans to Conn without calling them jesuitical, and seldom the Jesuits without describing them as the Puritans of Rome. The king hated both of them, hated the extremes which they represented, and he felt at the same time that extremes meet. He was too refined, too delicate, too aesthetic to endure the harshness which is inseparable from strong characters. His disgust at the Jesuits, and at the Puritans too, is quite as much due to moral as to political antagonism.

The main political result of the sympathy of Charles with Rome was, of course, the partial (not complete) suspension of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics during the time of his personal government. Though the king was obliged by his unfortunate marriage treaty to suspend the laws, he would hardly have done so, if it had not been repugnant to his mind to persecute men with whom he felt, to a certain degree, one in creed, whom, at least, he decidedly preferred to his Puritan subjects. All reasons of political expediency were against suspending the laws. If Charles by the suspension secured the good-will of France and the pope, he forfeited the confidence of his subjects. It is an acknowledged fact that his reluctance to put priests to death for their religion was one of the chief causes of the rupture between the crown and the Parliament. Count Rossetti, the papal agent, reports that soon after the dissolution of the Short Parliament Archbishop Laud on his knees implored Charles to enforce the penal laws against Catholics. But even after the full outbreak of the crisis, in the beginning of 1641, the king firmly declined to sacrifice the life of a priest, John Goodman, in order to win the good will of City and Parliament. "I do not sell men's lives", the king said. Rossetti writes in February, 1641: "The question whether Goodman shall live or die, has turned into the question whether the supreme authority lies with the king or the Parliament. There is no other topic of conversation at present."<sup>54</sup>

It would be a mistake to make the queen's influence with Charles responsible for his leniency towards the Catholics. In several instances her influence is visible, indeed, and is not very creditable to her judgment. But, as a whole, the direct influence of Henrietta Maria was not very great; she was not a politician. She exercised

<sup>53</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 8, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 288.

<sup>54</sup> Rossetti to Barberini, Feb. 8, 1641; cf. Gardiner, *History of England*, IX. 265.

however an indirect, unconscious influence which can hardly be overestimated. The personal attachment of Charles to his queen made it morally impossible for him to be harsh against her co-religionists. Especially at the time when she was about to become a mother (and that occurred six times during the period of the personal government of Charles), the king was anxious to avoid any sort of measure against Roman Catholics that was likely to cause her pain.

Had it not been for his lack of money, Charles would have willingly discharged the Catholics from their legal fines as well as from the danger to life and liberty. But he could not afford this, so he merely softened the burden of fines through selling letters patent which entitled the bearer to absent himself from the Anglican service. The annual return from these letters patent fell a good deal short of what Charles would have had, had he put the penal laws into force. The king, therefore, through favoring the Catholics, materially and morally weakened his sovereign power. When in the end he professed himself a martyr for his people, this has some justification in respect to at least one section of his people, his Roman Catholic subjects.

If we now ask the question, what Rome did, on the other hand, for Charles in return for all the favor shown to her children, the answer can only be: materially, nothing. Gifts out of her great treasury of art were the only acknowledgment. And, as a matter of fact, Rome could not do any more, as long as Charles did not become a convert. It is true there were the famous five millions of scudi in the Castle of S. Angelo, but according to the rules laid down by Pope Sixtus V., who had hoarded them, this treasure was not to be touched, except for averting the loss of a country from the Catholic Church, or for the re-conquest of the Holy Land, or some similar purpose. When, therefore, at the end of 1640, Queen Henrietta Maria sent a pathetic appeal for help to Cardinal Barberini,<sup>55</sup> his answer was bound to be: "Only in the case of the conversion of the king should I be in a position to ask His Holiness to unlock the treasure of S. Angelo."<sup>56</sup> The queen answered that the king would proclaim liberty of conscience if the pope helped to restore him; conversion at this moment would mean the loss of his crown. The cardinal replied coldly, that the king *had* lost his crown already (he wrote this in February, 1641), that liberty of conscience applied to all sects, while Rome wanted nothing except liberty for the

<sup>55</sup> She did so without any knowledge on the king's part: "Il n'i a personne que sa S.té vous et moy qui sache sesy encore". Barb. 8615, fols. 83-86.

<sup>56</sup> Barberini to Rossetti, Feb. 1, 1641. Barb. 8649, fol. 124; cf. Jan. 26, fol. 94.

Catholic religion, and this had been granted already by the marriage treaty.<sup>57</sup>

With the same definiteness with which Rome declared some years before that the articles of the Creed could not be matters of negotiation in bringing about the union, she now and hereafter professed herself unable to support the tottering throne of Charles, so long as one who was not an avowed Catholic was seated on it. Yet there can be no doubt that Charles never seriously contemplated becoming a convert or restoring the Church of Rome in any of his kingdoms. Even after the battle of Naseby had been fought, the king refused to secure the assistance of the Irish confederates by allowing them to have the existing churches, ready though he was to grant them freedom of worship in chapels which they built for themselves. For with him surrender of the churches would have meant abandonment of his religion and submission to rebellion. "I will rather chuse to suffer all extreamitie than ever to abandon my religion, and particularly either to English or Irish rebels."<sup>58</sup> Pride, quite as much as religion, forbade him to yield, and the feeling, once strong within him, of an affinity in culture with Rome, was now of no consequence whatever. The great idea which he cherished during the days of his happiness was reunion with Rome, but on equal terms, not in the way of submission. That he ever thought this possible shows how much he misunderstood both the Church of Rome and his own country.

ARNOLD OSKAR MEYER.

<sup>57</sup> Feb. 9, 16, June 15, 1641. Barb. 8649, fols. 153 *seq.*, fol. 175; Barb. 8650, fols. 15-17.

<sup>58</sup> The king to the Marquis of Ormond, Cardiff, July 31, 1645. Thomas Carte, *The Life of James Duke of Ormond*, VI. 306 (Oxford, 1851).